REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

This case has been carefully reviewed and analyzed in view of the Official Action dated 23 June 2005. Responsive to the rejections made in the Official Action, Claims 1 and 3-5 have been amended to more clearly clarify the inventive concept of the Applicant.

The Examiner has rejected Claims 1 – 2, 6 – 12 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)(1) as being anticipated by Sugita (U.S. Patent Application Publication 2003/0184521 A1). The Sugita reference is directed to a mouse with a storage section for a cord and the like.

Prior to a discussion of the prior art relied upon by the Examiner in the Official Action, it is believed that it would be beneficial to briefly review the subject Application in view of the inventive concept of the Applicant. The subject Patent Application is directed to a computer peripheral with an independently operable cable reeling device. The reeling device can be separated from the computer peripheral for independent use, or it can be connected to the input device of a computer peripheral for combined use. Use of any communication device, such as a computer, modem, telephone, or a fax machine, requires connection of a proper communication cable for transmission of electrical messages. One of the great problems associated with cable reeling devices is entanglement of the communication cable. This is due to the length of cable necessary for practical use. The subject Patent Application overcomes such problems and teaches a

peripheral input device with a detachable cable-reeling device that is independently operable thereby extending the use of the reel assembly.

The Sugita reference discloses a mouse with a cord storage compartment. Sugita specifically discloses, "... mouse provided therein with a cord storage compartment into which the cord can be retracted and stored, the mouse adapted to be electrically connected to an input board of a computer system ...". The mouse according to Sugita's disclosure allows the cord inclusive of the terminal section as well as the connection on the distal end of the cord to be stored into the storage compartment provided within the main body of the mouse. The cord storage compartment storing the cord together with the terminal section and the connector can be opened and closed by one-touch operation.

It is respectfully submitted that Sugita discloses a mouse with a retractable cord storage system as a whole without independently operable parts. Sugita does not teach the novel concept as provided by the subject Patent Application for having a reeling device that can be separated from the computer peripheral for independent use. Furthermore, the cable reeling device of the subject Patent Application connects to the computer peripheral in a detachable manner, so that the cable reeling device can be used independently with, for example, a computer, a modem, a telephone, or a fax machine, thus expanding the use of the reeling device.

Although Sugita does show a cable reeling device with a cable that can be extended and retracted, Sugita does not disclose or suggest, "...an input device detachably coupled with a front portion of the reeling device, and electrically coupled to the reeling device, said reeling device being independently operable with regard to said input device...." as recited in currently amended Claim 1.

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 1 – 2, 7 – 9, and 11 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Yong (U.S. Patent No. 6,088,021). Yong discloses a peripheral input device having a reel assembly internally disposed in a peripheral input device, such as a mouse, or a pointing stick type peripheral input device, to allow the cord to be extended and retracted between a first length and a second length.

It is respectfully submitted that the reel assembly of Yong is fixedly installed in the peripheral input device and cannot be used independently. The reel assembly is thus limited so as to have no other uses. The purpose of Yong is to provide an input device that contains a retractable cord for ease of operation and/or storage of the input device. Therefore, Yong fails to disclose or suggest, "...an input device detachably coupled with a front portion of the reeling device, and electrically coupled to the reeling device, said reeling device being independently operable with regard to said input device...", as recited in currently amended Claim 1.

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 3 – 5 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yong (U.S. Patent 6,088,021) in view of Davis (U.S. Patent 6,589,076). The Examiner states that Yong teaches all the limitations of Claims 3 – 5 except for computer peripheral comprising a third connector plugged into a second connector. The Examiner further states that the general concept of providing a plurality of connectors to the end of a cable falls within the realm of common knowledge as obvious duplication of parts which carry no patentable weight.

Davis, et al. relates to a computer cable connector providing quick assembly and removal. The object of Davis is to provide an electrical connector, particularly a shielded connector having a latching mechanism integral therewith. Even if Davis and Yong are combined, they do not provide, "...an input device detachably coupled with a front portion of the reeling device, and electrically coupled to the reeling device, said reeling device being independently operable with regard to said input device...." as recited in now amended Claim 1. While it is believed that dependent Claims 3 – 5 add further patentably distinct limitations, those claims are at least patentably distinct for the same reasons as independent Claim 1.

Furthermore, it is respectfully submitted that the cable with the connectors are unobvious. Since the reeling device is detachable from the input device, the reeling device can be used independently if the input device is broken. The

reeling device can be considered as an independent modular element wherein Applicant's claimed device is more environmentally protective.

It is not believed by the undersigned attorney that either Sugita or Yong references disclose or suggest a combination of elements which form the inventive concept of the subject Application for the purposes and objectives of the Applicant. It is not believed that any of the references anticipate the subject Patent Application system as now defined by amended Claims 1, 3, 4 and 5 .

The references cited by the Examiner but not used in the rejection have been reviewed and are believed to be further remote from the subject inventive concept as defined by the now amended claims than that used by the Examiner in his rejection.

It is now believed that the subject Patent Application has been placed in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,
FOR ROSENBERG, KLEIN & LEE

Morton J. Rosenberg
Registration #26,049

Dated: 9/19/05

Rosenberg, Klein & Lee
Suite 101
3458 Ellicott Center Drive
Ellicott City, MD 21043
(410) 465-6678

Customer No.
04586